MSATS Standing Data Review
- ## MSDR Issues Paper
- ## Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: *Evoenergy*

Completion Date: *26 March 2020*

https://aemo.com.au/consultations/current-and-closed-consultations/msats-standing-data-review

Table of Contents

1. Context

This template is to assist stakeholders in giving feedback to the questions raised in the issues paper about the proposed changes to the MSATS Standing Data.

2. Questions raised in the MSATS Standing Data Review Issues Paper

2.1 Metering Installation Information

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
General Metering Installation Information	1.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Number field to MSATS? If not, why not?	Support as it will help participants understand the life cycle status of a meter.
	2.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Expiry Date field to MSATS? If not, why not?	Not supported, as this date will either change as a new exemption is allocated due to volume of meters requiring replacement, or the meter is removed.
	3.	If you do not support the addition of the suggested fields, do you support the addition of the Meter Family Failure field?	Not supported, as you don't need multiple fields to identify a meter has a problem.
	4.	If you do not support the amendments proposed by AEMO, which ones and why?	Meter Suffix – Interval meters for some time have been making this field mandatory and populating with Ex, Qx etc., not Nx as per this document, but as per Standing Data for MSATS

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			v4.4 sections 12 and 14, to link the meter RegisterID to a Network Tariff, to a Data Stream Suffix and Time Of Day. I am also unable to find when this was changed or consulted on. Please provide the information for this?
	5.	What enumerations can be made for the Meter Use codes that would be useful for the market?	A = AVERAGE P = PREPAID
	6.	There are several existing fields that AEMO proposes removing from MSATS Standing Data. Do you see any value in their retention for the market? If so, please outline it.	No comment, so please remove.
	7.	Meter Constant may be a relevant field for older equipment as it refers to intrinsic constraint of meter in Wh/pulse. Is there value to this field for the market and if so is there another field that the constant could be listed in?	If there are still meters out there that require this, then retain, or better yet, replace those meters, so that this field can get removed.
	8.	A majority of workshop attendees did not support the inclusion of the aforementioned industry-proposed fields as they would not provide value to the market as a whole. Are any of them worth further consideration? If so, why and what value do they add to the market?	Not worth further consideration.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	9.	Do you have any other comments regarding the general Metering Installation Information fields?	No further comments
Metering Installation Transformer Information	10.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to splitting transformer information into CT and VT?	Yes
	11.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to adding new transformer information fields which includes: CT/VT Accuracy Class, CT/VT Last Test Date?	No, as this information, for older sites, may be difficult to obtain, but understand the benefits to the market.
	12.	Do you agree with the validations proposed by AEMO for the transformer information fields? If not, please provide other types of validations that can be applied.	Need to define this further as participants will hold this in their systems as 40, or 40:1, or 200/005. Are all acceptable?
	13.	Do you agree to not to add CT/VT serial number fields, and if you do not agree, can you propose solutions for adding those fields in (i.e. new NMI devices table) and will adding them provide more benefit than costs to your business and customers	Agree not to add serial numbers, as this information, for older sites, may be difficult to obtain, and does not add value.
Register Level Information	14.	Do you agree with amending the fields Controlled Load and Time of Day to include enumerated list of values? If Yes, what values can be in the enumerated list for the fields: - Controlled Load	Agree to amendments Proposed Controlled Load values No

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		- Time of Day	CL1
			CL2
			CL3
			Proposed Time of Day values
			INTERVAL
			PEAK
			BUSINESS
			SHOULDER
			EVENING
			OFFPEAK
			ALLDAY
			CONTROLLED
	15.	Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to remove the following fields? - Demand1 - Demand2 - Network Additional Information	Agree

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Connection and Metering point Details	16.	Do you agree with the proposal to include the Connection Configuration field as described above? Why/why not?	Agree, as it would provide relevant information to the new MPB before attending a site to exchange a meter, thus reduce costs. Must also include in C7 report.
	17.	Are there any connection configurations that could not be contained in the above Connection Configuration field?	What do you do if there are multiple meters at a NMI with different connection arrangements? E.g. 1 phase and 3 phase; WC meter and CT meter.
Shared Isolation Points Flag Field	18.	Are the values sufficient? What additional information should be provided, and how could it be validated?	Yes
	19.	Should "Unknown" be able to be changed into "Yes" / "No"?	Yes when newer information becomes available.
Metering Installation Location Information	20.	Do you support the deletion of Additional Site Information?	Yes
	21.	Are there any pieces of information that would be useful to explicitly flag for inclusion in the Meter Location field? (these can be included in the definition of the field)	No comment
	22.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for all rural sites?	No do not support, as it is a cost with no benefit to the current MPB. Should be captured as part of meter replacement or new installations.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	23.	If the provision of GPS coordinates for all rural NMIs were made mandatory, does your organisation support the use of "Designated regional area postcodes" to define "rural"? If not, what alternative would your organisation prefer?	Need a defined national source.
	24.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any sites with an MRIM meter?	No, as it is a cost with no benefit to the current MPB with no benefits.
	25.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any new installations?	Yes as it can be part of the meter installation process, if not already.
	26.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made mandatory for any other scenarios?	No
	27.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made required for any other scenarios?	For all existing NMI's.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	28.	Bearing in mind that GPS coordinates to four decimal places allow identification to the nearest 10 metres, that GPS coordinates to five decimal places allows identification to the nearest metre, and that GPS coordinates to six decimal places allows identification to the nearest 10 centimetres, if the field is added should it be to four, five, or six decimal places?	Four
Meter Read and Estimation Information	29.	Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to amend or remove the meter read and estimation information as per the proposal above, if not please specify which ones you do not agree with and why?	Agree
Meter Communications Information	30.	Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to remove the meter communications information fields as per the proposal above, if not please specify which ones you do not agree with and why?	Not required by any participant except the person that loaded it into MSATS, so please remove.

2.2 NMI details

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Address Structure	31.	Do you agree with the proposal to remove unstructured address fields, following a period for data holders to clean their existing data?	Yes, no longer required as an address can be found for any site, or made up based on various maps available for each NSP.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	32.	Are there any reasons to keep the Unstructured Address fields, given that additional locational information (e.g. "pump by the dam") can be provided in other fields, e.g. Location Descriptor where we have proposed to lengthen the characters available?	No, lose this field and increase the length of the Location Descriptor.
	33.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated by AEMO on the basis of structured address (as is currently done for DPIDs) and thereafter by LNSPs?	Only agree if the G-NAF has relevant information for Greenfield sites where construction has not yet started. Field should be Required, not Mandatory.
	34.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated entirely by LNSPs?	Disagree as this information is not available when NMI creation happens within network systems. Field should be Required, not Mandatory.
	35.	If AEMO were to add the G-NAF PID field (which would uniquely identify a physical address), do participants believe there is use in keeping the DPID field?	No, remove DPID.
	36.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were also to be added?	Yes, as we could use it in the ACT to assist in uniquely identifying an address (we also have a Section Number, but could map the DP number field as our Block Number).

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	37.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were not to be added?	Yes, preferred option.
Feeder Class	38.	Do you agree with the proposal to make Feeder Class required for the jurisdiction of Queensland?	Yes
Transmission Node Identifier2	39.	Do you agree with the proposal to introduce TNI2?	Yes

2.3 NER Schedule 7.1

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
NER Schedule 7.1 Rule Change	40.	Do you see any benefit in Schedule 7.1 remaining as-is? If so, please detail the benefit.	No, should not be detailed, but rather state the obvious minimum and changes to be consultated.
	41.	Do you support AEMO's proposal? If you do not, please detail why.	Yes
Fields referenced in the NER that are not	42.	Do you see any benefit in adding the aforementioned fields to MSATS? If so, in which table would you propose they be added and how can the quality of data be ensured?	These fields would add no benefit.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
implemented in MSATS			

3. Proposed Changes in Standing Data for MSATS Guideline 4.5

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
4 - SerialNumber	Incorporate changes from 5.0 into this version now as it adds clarity and start date aligns. "Use a dummy value for UMCP (Type 7), logical (meters) and non-contestable unmetered loads. Except for UMCP, logical and non-contestable unmetered loads (where a dummy value is used), SerialNumber should be as displayed on the physical device (also known as property number if it exists), otherwise the meter manufacturer's serial number."
8 – ElectricityDataStream/Suffix	Some participants will be switching over to E and Q values before 6 Feb 2022, so why is this document not including that option. Suggest removing all the wording that starts from "If the MeterInstallCode is…"
9 – SerialNumber	See note above for 4
9 – Suffix	See note above for 8

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
	Remove the last two sentences referring to interval and basic data streams.
12	Need to remove all reference to NET suffix and Nx, to allow a smoother transition to the new values. Remove the following sentences, or parts thereof: [paragraph 3] "For settlements purposes this data must be 'NET' [Export from network, less import to network] and will be 'Nx' for an interval Datastream, or numeric for an Accumulation Meter." [dot point 2] "For settlements purposes, Interval Meter Datastreams will be the NET suffix (format Nx) and for Accumulation Meter Datastreams the suffix value is numeric." [dot poin 3] "…Nx…
13.2	Fix the header spelling
14.3 – Table 31	Should add examples here with different RegisterID's to show flexibility and current values in MSATS.

Data Element: Values

Serial Number	RegisterID	UnitOfMeasure	TimeOfDay	Suffix
ABCD1111	002	KWH	INTERVAL	E1
ABCD1111	001	KWH	INTERVAL	B1
ABCD1111	004	KVARH	INTERVAL	Q1
ABCD1111	003	KVARH	INTERVAL	K1
ABCD1111	005	VOLTS	INTERVAL	V1

4. Proposed Changes in Standing Data for MSATS Guideline 5.1

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
Version Release History	Version 5.1 and now version 5.0 are missing the version 4.5 changes in here.
8 – ElectricityDataStream/Suffix	Wording needs to be corrected to help with interpretation. Change to: "The value must be a valid as per Datastream suffix details specified in the NMI Procedure."
9.1 – RegisterID and Suffix	Why was this added? Currently the RegisterID is an identifier to show that there are different channels on a meter that may have different NetworkTariffCode's, TimeOfDay's and ControlledLoad's assigned. The Suffix then informs you what DataStream to expect for that RegisterID when you receive an MDFF file. The RegisterID may not match the Suffix at all for any meter type. Remove the two dot points after second sentence in both table references. Why make this matching as it removes a lot of flexibility. Need to also correct v5.0.
12	Need to remove all reference to NET suffix and Nx, to allow clarity to the new values. Remove the following sentences, or parts thereof:

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
	[paragraph 6] "For settlements purposes this data must be 'NET' [Export from network, less import to network] and will be 'Nx' for an interval Datastream, or numeric for an Accumulation Meter." [dot point 2] "For settlements purposes, Interval Meter Datastreams will be the NET suffix (format Nx) and for Accumulation Meter Datastreams the suffix value is numeric." [dot poin 3] "…Nx… Last paragraph needs to be split as it was in previous versions.
14.3 – Table 50	Should add examples here with different RegisterID's to show flexibility and current values.

Data Element: Values

Serial Number	RegisterID	UnitOfMeasure	TimeOfDay	Suffix
ABCD1111	002	KWH	INTERVAL	E1
ABCD1111	001	KWH	INTERVAL	B1
ABCD1111	004	KVARH	INTERVAL	Q1
ABCD1111	003	KVARH	INTERVAL	K1
ABCD1111	005	VOLTS	INTERVAL	V1

5. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Heading	Participant Comments
Version control	Some of the fields were discussed in consultation for 5MS, and were updated then providing better descriptions and information. Why has that not been incorporated into v4.5 as those were not related to new fields? Don't need to describe the NET or Nx values in this document and refer to the NMI Procedure.